

Appln. No. 10/782,066
Amendment dated November 3, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed August 5, 2005

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 through 13 remain in this application. Claims 2 and 14 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn. Claims 15 and 16 have been added.

Paragraphs 1 through 6 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 5, 9, 11, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Weisberg.

Claims 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weisberg in view of Upton.

Claim 1, particularly as amended, requires "wherein said support assembly comprises a rail member extending between said first end and said second end and a carriage member slidably mounted on said rail member for movement between said first end and said second end, said mail receiving member being mounted on said carriage member, said carriage member straddling said rail member" and "wherein said drive member includes a cable extending between said first end and said carriage member, and a chain extending between said carriage member and said second end, free ends of said cable being mounted on said carriage member and free ends of said carriage member being mounted on said carriage member."

It is therefore submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Weisberg and Upton set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claim 1. Further, claims 3 through 5, 9, and 11 through 13, which depend from claim 1, also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Appln. No. 10/782,066
Amendment dated November 3, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed August 5, 2005

Withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections of claims 1, 3 through 5, 9, and 11 through 13 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action states that claim 6 through 8 and 10 would be allowable if written into independent form with the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The above amendment incorporates the limitations of claim 1, 2, 4, and 5 (in their as-filed form) into the recitation of claim 6, and therefore claim 6 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 7 and 8, by virtue of their dependency from amended claim 6, are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

The above amendment incorporates the limitations of claim 1, 2, 4, and 10 (in their as-filed form) into the recitation of added claim 16, and therefore claim 16 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. 40,158
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357

Date: Nov. 3, 2005